

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the:
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

REC'D 12 APR 2005

WIPO

PCT

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) **07 APR 2005**

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

Applicant's or agent's file reference
A*/I2R-P032WO

International application No.
PCT/SG2005/000014

International filing date (day/month/year)
20 January 2005

Priority date (day/month/year)
26 January 2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
Int. Cl. ⁷ H01Q 1/52, 1/36, 1/38

Applicant
AGENCY FOR SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND RESEARCH et al

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I | Basis of the opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. II | Priority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/AU
**AUSTRALIAN PATENT OFFICE
PO BOX 200, WODEN ACT 2606, AUSTRALIA
E-mail address: pct@ipaaustralia.gov.au
Facsimile No. (02) 6285 3929**

Authorized Officer
MANI RAMACHANDRAN
Telephone No. (02) 6283 2233

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/SG2005/000014

Box No. I	Basis of the opinion
1.	<p>With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).</p>
2.	<p>With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:</p> <p>a. type of material</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> a sequence listing</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> table(s) related to the sequence listing</p> <p>b. format of material</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> in written format</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> in computer readable form</p> <p>c. time of filing/furnishing</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> contained in the international application as filed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> filed together with the international application in computer readable form.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.</p>
3.	<p><input type="checkbox"/> In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.</p>
4.	<p>Additional comments:</p>

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/SG2005/000014

Box No. V **Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims 4, 12	YES
	Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-16	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims 4, 12	YES
	Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-16	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims 1-16	YES
	Claims	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

NOVELTY & INVENTIVE STEP Claims 1-16:

The invention defined in independent claims 1 and 9 lacks novelty and an inventive step in the light of the disclosure in US 5995055 A (MILROY) 30 November 1999, in particular see Figs 6 and 7 and the corresponding description. Excepting appended claims 4 and 12, which talk about the relationship between the inter-element spacing and the lateral spacing, the other claims recite trivial shape and construction features of the antenna elements that would have been obvious to a skilled addressee. Therefore, with the exceptions of claims 4 and 12, the invention lacks novelty and an inventive step.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/SG2005/000014

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

1. The independent claims are not fully supported by the description in that they do not recite that the first and the second ground conductors are continuous. A continuous ground conductor substrate is noticed in all the embodiments, and no other possible variation or disposition of ground conductors is described in the specification. It is noticed that this limitation is only introduced in appended claims 3 and 11.